REMARKS

Claims 1-94 are currently pending. Claims 82-93 have been newly added and claim 2 has been amended. Applicant reserves the right to pursue original and other claims in this and any other application.

Claim 2 has been amended to correct an informality. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 21, 26, 27, 45, 46, 64, and 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hinoda et al (U.S. 4,547,074)("Hinoda"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, an image sensor pixel comprising: "a semiconductor substrate; a photoconversion device formed within said semiconductor substrate; a dielectric layer formed over said photoconversion device; and a mesh optical filter positioned over said dielectric layer and photoconversion device for passing light of a specific wavelength to said photoconversion device."

Hinoda discloses "A color sensing device comprising fourth photo-electric transducers formed on a semiconductor substrate, an interference filter provided on the light receiving face of each transducer, a colored filter for selecting a specified transmission band of the interference filter, and three electrodes for delivering electric signals from the transducers individually, one of the electrodes being provided for two of the transducers in common." (Hinoda, abstract).

The invention of Hinoda requires the use of colored filters to select the light to pass through its associated filters. (Hinoda, Col. 4, ln. 1-30). The mesh filters of the

claimed invention select the light without the use of color filters. ("Metal mesh filters...may be designed to filter electromagnetic radiation according to wavelength." Mouli, Summary of the invention). Hinoda fails to disclose "a mesh optical filter positioned over said dielectric layer and photoconversion device for passing light of a specific wavelength to said photoconversion device." As such, the interference filters of the invention of Hinoda are different from the mesh filters of the claimed invention. As such, the rejection of claim 1 based on Hinoda should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 21, 26, 45, 64, and 78 have similar limitations as claims 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

Dependant claims 27 and 45 depend from independent claims 26 and 45, respectively, and are allowable for at least the reasons noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Claims 2-20, 22-25, 28-44, 47-63, 65-77, and 80-81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Hinoda et al (U.S. 4,547,074)("Hinoda"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 2-20, 22-25, 28-44, 47-63, 65-77, and 80-81 are dependant from independent claims 1, 21, 26, 45, 64, and 78, and are allowable for at least the reasons noted above with respect to those claims.

Claims 82-93 have been newly added. No new matter has been added. Claims 82-93 define the invention in terms of use of an apertured optical filter. The prior art applied in the office action and discussed above do not employ apertured optical filters without color filters. Accordingly, new claims 82-93 are also in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Thomas J. D'Amico
Registration No.: 28,371
Michael A. Weinstein
Registration No.: 53,754
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
2101 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20037-1526
(202) 785-9700
Attorneys for Applicant